

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 10, 28, 48, 69-97 were pending. Claims 10, 28, 48, 72, 73, 77, 86, 87, 89, 93, 94, and 96 were rejected. Claims 69-71, 74-76, 78-85, 88, 90-92, 95, and 97 were objected to. In this response, claims 10 and 28 have been cancelled. Claims 48, 69, 70, 75, 77-86, and 88-97 have been amended without introducing any new matter. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 48 and 69-97 remain pending. Reconsideration of this application, in light of the following arguments, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 28 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,708. However, the Applicants have cancelled claims 10 and 28. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting be withdrawn.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 69-71, 74-76, 78-85, 88, 90-92, 95, and 97 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten to include all the limitations of the claims from which they each originally depend. The Applicants have so amended claims 69, 70, 84, 85, 88, 90, 91, 92, 95, and 97, to independent form to include the limitations of the base claims from which they originally depended. Therefore, the Applicants submit that independent claims 69, 70, 84, 85, 88, 90, 91, 92, 95, and 97 are now in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Furthermore, dependent claims 71, 74-76, 78-83 depend, or have been amended to depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the noted allowable independent claims. Because the dependent claims include additional features and limitations to those claims that have been admitted to contain allowable matter, the Applicants respectfully submit

that the dependent claims 71, 74-76, 78-83 also contain allowable matter, and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claim 10, 28, 48, 72-73, 77, 86-87, 89, 93-94, and 96 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over an article entitled “VolanoChat Java solution turns ordinary Web sites into interactive money makers”, Business Wire, pp1-2 (“Volano”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,572,619 of Judson (hereinafter “Judson”), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,862,330 of Anupam et al. (hereinafter “Anupam”), and further in view of “The Sociable Web” by Donath et al. (hereinafter “Donath”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejections.

With respect to claim 48, the Applicants have amended the claim to include matter which the Examiner has admitted is allowable over the prior art. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 48, as amended, is not rendered obvious under § 103 in view of the cited references. Furthermore, claims 86, 87, and 93 depend from claim 48, and add additional features and limitations to those claimed in claim 48. Since claim 48 is not obvious under § 103, then dependent claims 86, 87, and 93 are also not rendered obvious under § 103.

With respect to claims 72, 73, and 89, the Applicants have amended claim 69, from which claims 72, 73, and 89 depend, to include matter which the Examiner has admitted is allowable over the prior art. As such, the Applicants submit that claim 69 is not rendered obvious under § 103 in view of the cited references. Furthermore, claims 72, 73, and 89 depend from claim 69, and add additional features and limitations to those claimed in claim 69. Since claim 69 not obvious under § 103, dependent claims 72, 73, and 89 are also not rendered obvious by the references under § 103.

With respect to claim 77, the Applicants have amended claim 70, from which claim 77 depends, to include matter which the Examiner has admitted is allowable over

the prior art. Similar to the discussion above, the Applicants submit that claim 70 is not rendered obvious under § 103 by the cited references. Furthermore, claim 77 depends from claim 70, and adds additional features and limitations to those claimed in claim 70. Since claim 70 is not obvious under § 103, dependent claim 77 is also not rendered obvious under § 103.

With respect to claims 94 and 96, the Applicants have amended claim 92, from which claims 94 and 96 depend, to include matter which the Examiner has admitted is allowable over the prior art. As such, the Applicants submit that claim 92, as amended, is not rendered obvious by the cited references under § 103. Furthermore, claims 94 and 96 depend from claim 92, and add additional features and limitations to those claimed in claim 92. Since claim 92 is not obvious under § 103 in view of the cited references, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 94 and 96 are also not rendered obvious under § 103.

Therefore, the Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 48, 72, 73, 77, 86, 87, 89, 93, 94, and 96 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 48, 72, 73, 77, 86, 87, 89, 93, 94, and 96 are now in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

## CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

10/12/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael J. Mallie  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300  
Fax (408) 720-8383